

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested since no new issues are raised by entry of the Amendment and the Amendment places the Application in condition for allowance, or at least in better form for appeal.

Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Buttiker (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0176583). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method for modifying validity of a certificate using biometric information in a public key infrastructure-based authentication system that includes accessing a server of the certificate authority using login information of the user in response to a certificate validity modification request from the user under the condition that he/she is registered as a member in the authentication system; inputting the biometric information for a user authentication through a biometric information input unit in the user system; generating a certificate validity modification request message in response to the certificate validity modification request from the user; and sending the inputted biometric information and the generated certificate validity modification request message to the certificate authority to request the certificate validity modification online.

As discussed previously, Buttiker is directed to a process and to an end objective that are completely distinct from those to which the pending application is directed. In particular, while the pending claims of the present application are directed to a method for modifying online the validity of certificates by users who are registered members of a PKI-based authentication system, Buttiker pertains exclusively to a system, method and token for registering new users to a public key infrastructure (PKI) system.

Although the Examiner is correct with regard to Buttiker disclosing a certification authority for issuing certificates based on the approved user's certification request, the Buttiker disclosure is specifically directed to registering new users, not modifying the validity of existing certificates. The discussion of the certification authority 102 in Buttiker is merely to illustrate a complete PKI system. Buttiker does not disclose, teach or suggest any type of certificate modification. See, for example, paragraphs [0001]-[0003], [0050]-[0056].

As set forth in M.P.E.P. 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art

reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Buttiker does not disclose the features recited in claim 1. Specifically, Buttiker merely discloses a registration process and therefore, fails to disclose or suggest, for example, a certificate validity modification request or, a user that is already a member in the system. The mere existence of a certification authority is not sufficient to anticipate or obviate the certificate validity modification method recited in claim 1

Accordingly, Buttiker fails to teach, or even suggest, a method for modifying validity of a certificate using biometric information in a public key infrastructure-based authentication system that includes accessing a server of the certificate authority using login information of the user in response to a certificate validity modification request from the user under the condition that he/she is registered as a member in the authentication system; inputting the biometric information for a user authentication through a biometric information input unit in the user system; generating a certificate validity modification request message in response to the certificate validity modification request from the user; and sending the inputted biometric information and the generated certificate validity modification request message to the certificate authority to request the certificate validity modification online, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 3 is believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 since claim 3 recites features that are similar to the features of claim 1 discussed above.

Claims 2 and 4-15 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 3 by virtue of their dependence upon claims 1 and 3. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By: 

Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307
Direct No. (202) 263-3280

YSH/VVK

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: May 15, 2006